REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-14, 16-17, and 20-28 are pending.

Claims 1, 14, and 23 are independent and have been amended.

Claims 26, 27, and 28 are new.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, and 11-13 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Amendments have been made to clarify the statutory subject matter included in claim 1. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn. Each of claims 3, 4, 7-9, and 11-13 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore have been clarified by way of the amendment to claim 1 to better describe the statutory subject matter included in these claims. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 7-9, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, and 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,347,307 (hereinafter "Sandhu") in view of United States Patent No. 6,757,710 (hereinafter "Reed").

"To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." MPEP § 706.02(j).

8

Sandhu is directed at a system and method for engage in capital market transactions. (Sandhu, abstract). Sandhu describes the use of XML to create financial objects. (Sandhu, col. 49, lines 22-25). Sandhu utilizes the Document Object Model ("DOM") to create a standard set of objects and a standard way in which the objects are combined, accessed, and manipulated. (Sandhu, col. 49, lines 29-31).

Sandhu taken alone, or in combination with Reed, fails to teach at least the step of amended claim 1 of the present application "wherein the Factory entity is capable of generating a plurality of objects." The use such a Factory reduces the need for users to manually input excessive amounts of information while modeling a financial product. (Present application as published, paragraph [0024]). Sandhu describes the possibility of combining object but fails to describe the combination of objects wherein such object are "capable of generating a plurality of objects." As a result, Sandhu fails to describe all elements of amended claim 1.

In addition, Reed taken alone, or in combination with Sandhu,, fails to cure the deficiencies of Sandhu. Reed describes dragging and dropping icons in order to manages business affairs, such as discussion threads and meetings. (Reed, col. 143 line 50-59). However, Reed fails to address the use of a Factory "wherein the Factory entity is capable of generating a plurality of objects," as provided for in amended claim 1.

Therefore, neither Sandhu not Reed, either taken alone, or in combination, teaches, suggests or makes obvious utilizing an object "wherein at least one of the objects is a Factory entity, wherein the Factory entity is capable of generating a plurality of objects." As a result, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 14 and 20 while differing in form and scope from amended claim 1, recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, and are thus deemed patentable over Sandhu in view of Reed for the reasons discussed above with respect to the patentability of amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended claims 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Each of dependent claims 3, 4, 7-9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 22 ultimately depend from one of amended claims 1, 14, and 20 and are therefore patentable over Sandhu in view of Reed for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claims 1, 14, and 20. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended claims 3, 4, 7-9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Sandhu in view of Reed fails to teach, suggest, or make obvious the use of a Watcher entity "wherein the Watcher entity comprises; a set of expressions that refer to the financial product," as described in amended claim 23. Sandhu describes the uses of objects but fails to describe the use of an object wherein the object references a financial product. Therefore, Sandhu fails to teach, suggest, or make obvious all limitations of amended claim 23. In addition, Reed fails to cure the deficiencies of Sandhu. As a result, neither Sandhu nor Reed, either taken alone, or in combination, teaches, suggests or makes obvious utilizing a Watcher entity wherein the "Watcher entity comprises; a set of expressions that refer to the financial product." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Each of dependent claims 24 and 25 depend from amended claim 23 and are therefore patentable over Sandhu in view of Reed for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

New Claims

By this amendment, Applicant has added new claims 26-28. Support for these claims can be found in the present application as published at least at paragraphs [0024]-[0028]. Applicant submits that these new claims are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the current pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 23, 2009

/Brian W. Weber/
Brian W. Weber, Esq.
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 58,628

Lowenstein Sandler PC
Docket Administrator
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068

12